

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

March 24, 2008

Lorri Cameron, MPH, PhD
Michigan Department of Community Health
201 Townsend, PO Box 30195
Lansing, MI 480909

Dear Lorri:

I've put together cost estimates for your question about allowing counties or clusters of counties to purchase supplemental samples of BRFs interviews in the course of our collecting data for the Michigan Behavioral Risk Factor Survey.



A Division of the

**INSTITUTE FOR
PUBLIC POLICY AND
SOCIAL RESEARCH**

321 Berkey Hall
East Lansing, Michigan
48824-111

517/355-6672
FAX: 517/432-1544
www.ippsr.msu.edu

Larry A. Hembroff, Ph.D.
Director,
Sr. Survey Methodologist
517/353-1763
hembroff@msu.edu

As I mentioned in our phone conversation and as Ann Rafferty noted in her email response to you, OSR has had the contract with MDCH to collect the state's annual BRFs data for more than a decade. For the past 6 or 7 years, there has been an agreement between OSR and MDCH that would allow individual or clusters of counties to contract with OSR to conduct a BRFs of their county. OSR would agree to conduct the survey at a discounted cost of survey management while MDCH would agree to all Michigan BRFs interviews from that particular county to be added to the sample purchased directly by the county. The effect is that counties would get a data set containing a larger sample of respondents than they might otherwise be able to afford. For the most part, counties would pay the incremental cost of collecting the additional interviews they want from their county rather than the cost of a whole survey.

A portion of the incremental cost is the purchase of supplemental samples of RDD phone numbers, some additional management time, but also the cost of integrating the MBRFS interviews from the county into the county-specific sample and constructing the caseweights so the file is ready for analysis.

On the next page, I am providing the cost breakdowns for scenarios in which the county contracts with OSR for 400, 600, 800 or 1,200 interviews. For these, I have assumed the average interview lasts 15 minutes (equivalent to the BRFs core). I've also assumed the full implementation of the BRFs calling protocol.

I've also attached a page showing the 2000 Census population counts for each county, the total population of the state, the percentage of the state's population that comes from each county, and the estimated number of interviews likely to come from each county in this year's MBRFS sample of 9,000 interviews. This will give you an idea of the approximate number of additional interviews each county could expect to add from MBRFS that could be added to those they

they actually purchased if they had done so during this BRFS year.

I've also indicated the cost to have us analyze the data and prepare a summary report. For this, I've assumed the work would involve about 55 hours of time of an analyst billing hours at \$86 per hour.

BUDGET SUMMARY

Date: 3/24/2008		Incremental cost of n=400 per county	Incremental cost of n=600 per county	Incremental cost of n=800 per county	Incremental cost of n=1200 per county
Staff Salaries		\$ 6,726	\$ 7,428	\$ 7,799	\$ 8,376
Grad Assists.		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Training		\$ 284	\$ 427	\$ 569	\$ 853
Production Labor		\$ 8,735	\$ 13,013	\$ 17,290	\$ 25,846
Phones		\$ 1,851	\$ 2,777	\$ 3,702	\$ 5,553
Sample		\$ 307	\$ 385	\$ 464	\$ 621
Supplies		\$ 1,376	\$ 1,583	\$ 1,791	\$ 2,205
Postage		\$ 808	\$ 1,212	\$ 1,616	\$ 2,424
Equipment Fees		\$ 689	\$ 1,026	\$ 1,363	\$ 2,037
Software Fees		\$ 636	\$ 947	\$ 1,258	\$ 1,880
Network Fees		\$ 3,972	\$ 5,917	\$ 7,862	\$ 11,753
Travel (Airfare to BRFS conference)		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Meals (3 days)		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Lodging (3 nights)		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Printing Report		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TOTAL DIRECT		\$ 25,384	\$ 34,714	\$ 43,714	\$ 61,547
Per INVW Cost =		\$63.46	\$57.86	\$54.64	\$51.29
If MBRFS contributes	n= 36	\$ 58.22	\$54.58	\$52.29	\$49.80
	n= 75	\$53.44	\$51.43	\$49.96	\$48.27
	n= 100	\$50.77	\$49.59	\$48.57	\$47.34
	n= 150	\$46.15	\$46.29	\$46.01	\$45.59
	n= 200	\$42.31	\$43.39	\$43.71	\$43.96
Analysis and Report	\$ 4,730				

2000 Census Counts for Michigan Counties

	total		% of State's Population	Likely yield of county interviews from MBRFS
Michigan	9,938,444		100.0%	9000
COUNTY				
Ontonagon County	7,818		0.1%	7
Oscoda County	9,418		0.1%	9
Delta County	38,520		0.4%	35
Menominee County	25,326		0.3%	23
Dickinson County	27,472		0.3%	25
Ogemaw County	21,645		0.2%	20
Gladwin County	26,023		0.3%	24
Alcona County	11,719		0.1%	11
Charlevoix County	26,090		0.3%	24
Otsego County	23,301		0.2%	21
Wexford County	30,484		0.3%	28
Huron County	36,079		0.4%	33
Shiawassee County	71,687		0.7%	65
Antrim County	23,110		0.2%	21
Missaukee County	14,478		0.1%	13
Mackinac County	11,943		0.1%	11
Kalkaska County	16,571		0.2%	15
Montmorency County	10,315		0.1%	9
Barry County	56,755		0.6%	51
Cheboygan County	26,448		0.3%	24
Alpena County	31,314		0.3%	28
Leelanau County	21,119		0.2%	19
Presque Isle County	14,411		0.1%	13
Sanilac County	44,547		0.4%	40
Benzie County	15,998		0.2%	14
Oceana County	26,873		0.3%	24
Roscommon County	25,469		0.3%	23
Clare County	31,252		0.3%	28
Osceola County	23,197		0.2%	21
Grand Traverse County	77,654		0.8%	70
Iosco County	27,339		0.3%	25
Hillsdale County	46,527		0.5%	42
Livingston County	156,951		1.6%	142
Emmet County	31,437		0.3%	28
Clinton County	64,753		0.7%	59
Mason County	28,274		0.3%	26
Lapeer County	87,904		0.9%	80
Houghton County	36,016		0.4%	33
Midland County	82,874		0.8%	75
Ottawa County	238,314		2.4%	216

Tuscola County	58,266		0.6%	53	
Iron County	13,138		0.1%	12	
Newaygo County	47,874		0.5%	43	
Bay County	110,157		1.1%	100	
Allegan County	105,665		1.1%	96	
Marquette County	64,634		0.7%	59	
Crawford County	14,273		0.1%	13	
Manistee County	24,527		0.2%	22	
Schoolcraft County	8,903		0.1%	8	
Gogebic County	17,370		0.2%	16	
Arenac County	17,269		0.2%	16	
Monroe County	145,945		1.5%	132	
Isabella County	63,351		0.6%	57	
St. Clair County	164,235		1.7%	149	
Lenawee County	98,890		1.0%	90	
Montcalm County	61,266		0.6%	55	
St. Joseph County	62,422		0.6%	57	
Branch County	45,787		0.5%	41	
Macomb County	788,149		7.9%	714	
Keweenaw County	2,301		0.0%	2	
Mecosta County	40,553		0.4%	37	
Gratiot County	42,285		0.4%	38	
Ionia County	61,518		0.6%	56	
Baraga County	8,746		0.1%	8	
Van Buren County	76,263		0.8%	69	
Eaton County	103,655		1.0%	94	
Chippewa County	38,543		0.4%	35	
Alger County	9,862		0.1%	9	
Cass County	51,104		0.5%	46	
Luce County	7,024		0.1%	6	
Jackson County	158,422		1.6%	143	
Kent County	574,335		5.8%	520	
Kalamazoo County	238,603		2.4%	216	
Oakland County	1,194,156		12.0%	1081	
Ingham County	279,320		2.8%	253	
Calhoun County	137,985		1.4%	125	
Lake County	11,333		0.1%	10	
Washtenaw County	322,895		3.2%	292	
Muskegon County	170,200		1.7%	154	
Berrien County	162,453		1.6%	147	
Saginaw County	210,039		2.1%	190	
Genesee County	436,141		4.4%	395	
Wayne County	2,061,162		20.7%	1867	
			If MBRFS n=		
	9,938,444		9000		

There is little difference in surveying a sparsely populated county and a densely populated county except in the overall cooperativeness of householders, i.e., the response rate. Urban areas tend to have lower response rates so it takes more sample and more calling to produce the same number of completed interviews compared to a more rural area.

I hope this is helpful. Let me know if you have questions.

Cordially,

Larry A. Hembroff, Ph.D.
Survey Director